FILE COPY

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
OCT
JAMES R. BROWNING, Clerk

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1959

No. 496

COLUMBIA CASUALTY COMPANY,
Petitioner,

versus

ANTHONY LOCICERO, ET AL.,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT.

ERNEST A. CARRERE, JR., of
JONES, WALKER, WAECHTER,
POITEVENT, CARRERE &
DENEGRE,
Attorneys for Petitioner,
1547 National Bank of
Commerce Building,
New Orleans 12, Louisiana.

Of Counsel:
A. J. WAECHTER, JR.

INDEX

		Page
I	CITATION TO OPINION BELOW	2
II	JURISDICTION	2
III	THE QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW	2
IV	STATUTE INVOLVED	3
V	STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
VI	REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT	6
VII	CONCLUSION	14
APPENDIX A—Decision of United States Circuit Court of Appeal		15
APPENDIX B—Statute		25

AUTHORITIES CITED

Citations

Best v. District of Columbia, 291 US 411, 54 S. Ct. 748, 37 L.Ed. 642 (1893)	7
Purchan v. J. P. Stevens & Company, 209 F.2d 35, (CCA 4th 1954)	8
d'Ambrosio v. Philadelphia, 1946, 354 Pa. 403, 47 A.2d 256, 174 A.L.R. 1166	13
Isaacs v. City and County of San Francisco, 73 CA2d 621, 167 P.2d 221	11
Jinks v. Currie, 1936, 324 Pa. 532, 188 A. 356	13
Landis v. Conestoga Transportation Co. 1944, 349 Pa 97, 100, 36 A.2d 465	13

AUTHORITIES CITED—(Continued):

	Page
Lavender v. Kurn, 327 US 645, 66 S.Ct. 740, 90 L.Ed. 916 (1946)	7, 8
Richmond & Danville RR Co. v. Powers, et al., 149 US 43, 13 S.Ct. 748, 37 L.Ed. 642 (1893)	6, 7
Rogers v. Minneapolis St. Ry. Co., Minn. 16 NW2d 758	11
Texas & Pacific Railroad Co. v. Harvey, 228 US 319, 33 S.Ct. 518, 57 L.Ed. 852 (1912)	7
Thomas v. Roland, 162 F.Supp. 622 (USDC E. D. Pa. 1958)	12
Travis v. Collett, 218 Minn. 592, 17 NW2d 68 (1944)	10
Waid v. Chesapeake & Ohio RR Co., 14 F2d 90, 93	9
Webb v. Illinois Central Railroad Co., 352 US 512, 77 S.Ct. 451, 1 L.Ed. 2d 503 (1957)	7

Statutes

Code of the City of New Orleans, 1956, Section 38-37	3

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES.

OCTOBER TERM, 1959.

No.

COLUMBIA CASUALTY COMPANY,
Petitioner,

versus

ANTHONY LoCICERO, ET AL.,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT.

To the Honorable, the Chief Judge and the Associate Justices of the United States:

COLUMBIA CASUALTY COMPANY prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, dated June 30, 1959, wherein a rehearing was denied on July 31, 1959.

I.

CITATION TO OPINION BELOW.

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit is reported in 268 F.2d 440, and is printed in Appendix A hereto, *infra* page 15.

II.

JURISDICTION.

The jurisdiction of this Court to review this case on certiorari is invoked under 28 U.S. Code, Section 1254(1).

III.

THE QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW.

Reversing the judgment of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana, entered pursuant to a jury verdict for the defendant, the Court of Appeals held that the defendant's insured's driver was guilty of negligence as a matter of law. The alleged negligence of the defendant's insured's driver was based on an ordinance requiring that the driver of an emergency vehicle sound a siren "to the extent reasonably necessary". Contrary to the jury verdict, the Court of Appeals held that the question of when and to the extent it was reasonably necessary to sound a siren was a matter of law rather than a question of fact.

This decision in effect deprives the defendant of the right to a jury determination of the question of negligence guaranteed by the Seventh Amendment to the United States Constitution, and ignores the repeated holdings of this Court to the effect that where fair-minded men may draw different conclusions, even from undisputed facts, a question of fact for the jury is presented.

IV.

STATUTE INVOLVED.

The only statute involved is the Traffic Ordinance of the City of New Orleans printed in Appendix B *infra* page 25: Chapter 38 of the Code of the City of New Orleans, 1956, Section 38-37.

V.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

Anthony LoCicero, a pedestrian, was struck by a police squad car which was on an emergency mission in the City of New Orleans, and died some months later. The respondents (plaintiffs below) are the surviving major children of the deceased. The petitioner (defendant below) is the automobile liability insurer of the City of New Orleans. The facts are simple and for the most part uncontroverted:

On October 11, 1956 at approximately 5:00 P.M., the Police Department was notified that there was a holdup in progress at the French Market on Decatur Street in the City of New Orleans. A police squad car was dispatched

to the scene of the reported holdup. The police car proceeded without incident from the Station House to Decatur Street and turned north on that street a number of blocks south of its ultimate destination. Decatur Street was a wide two-way street running approximately north and south. After turning on to Decatur Street, the police car encountered a long time of traffic headed in the same direction, stopped at a red signal light at the intersection of Wilkinson Street with Decatur Street. The squad car drove to the left of this line of stopped traffic and upon arriving at the red signal light at Wilkinson Street, momentarily stopped or slowed almost to a stop. Since no traffic was approaching on the intersecting street, the police car proceeded past the red light and after successfully negotiating the intersection, returned to its proper lane of traffic. From this intersection to the French Market, a number of blocks to the north, Decatur Street was straight and completely clear of either pedestrian or vehicular traffic and the car rapidly accelerated to a maximum speed of between thirty and thirty-five miles per hour. There was a long line of traffic on Decatur Street heading in a southerly direction, opposite to the direction of the squad car, which was stopped for the red signal light at the intersection. As the police car passed the next intersection, a short City block to the north of the Wilkinson Street signal light, the deceased suddenly emerged from between two cars directly into the path of the squad car. The point at which the deceased was attempting to cross the street was north of the intersection and was not an authorized pedestrian crossing. At the instant that the deceased

emerged from between the parked cars into the view of the driver of the police car, the driver made an emergency application of the brakes but was unable to stop before striking the deceased.

The Traffic Ordinance of the City of New Orleans (Appendix, B) provides that the driver of an emergency vehicle may exceed the speed limit and proceed past a red stop light after slowing down to the extent necessary for safe operation, provided that the driver "sounds a siren, bell or exhaust whistle to the extent reasonably necessary" and displays a lighted red lamp visible from the front. The speed limit on Decatur Street was twenty miles per hour. The police car admittedly displayed a flashing red dome light visible from the front but did not sound its siren.

The Trial Judge included in his instructions to the jury on the law of negligence the applicable provisions of the New Orleans City Traffic Ordinance, and advised the jury that a violation of this ordinance by the driver of the police vehicle constituted negligence. The jury rendered a verdict in favor of petitioner (defendant below) and respondents perfected an appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. The Court of Appeals held that the District Judge erred in not instructing the jury that the defendant was guilty of negligence as a matter of law for not sounding a siren, remanding the case for a new trial.

VI.

REASONS FOR GRANTING WRIT.

The Court of Appeal Erred in Reversing the Judgment Based on a Jury Verdict and Departed from Repeated Decisions of this Honorable Court when it Held that the Question of Negligence was a Matter of Law for the Court to Decide Rather than a Question of Fact for the Jury where the Applicable Standard of Care Required Reasonable Conduct.

The standard of care imposed on the defendant's insured's driver in this case by the applicable statutory provision required that he sound a siren "to the extent reasonably necessary". It seems axiomatic that under such a statutory provision the question of when and to the extent it is reasonably necessary to sound a siren depends upon the factual circumstances presented by each case, and is a question of fact which must be decided by the trier of the facts. In this case the fact was established without contradiction that the police car had a clear, unobstructed roadway in front of it, and although under these circumstances some might believe that it was negligence to fail to sound a siren, others might as readily believe that it was not reasonably necessary to do so. The holding of the Court of Appeals that under the circumstances of this case the failure to sound a siren constituted negligence, has deprived petitioner of its constitutional right to have the issue tried by a jury and is in direct conflict with this Honorable Court's interpretation of the tests to be applied to determine which issues are jury questions. *Richmond & Danville RR. Co. v.*

Powers, et al., 149 US 43, 13 S.Ct. 748, 37 L.Ed. 642 (1893); *Best v. District of Columbia*, 291 US 411, 54 S.Ct. 487, 78 L.Ed. 882 (1934); *Texas & Pacific RR Co. vs. Harvey*, 228 US 319, 33 S.Ct. 518, 57 L.Ed. 852 (1912); *Lavender v. Kurn*, 327 US 645, 66 S.Ct 740, 90 L.Ed. 916 (1946); *Webb v. Illinois Central Railroad Co.*, 352 US 512, 77 S.Ct. 451, 1 L.Ed. 2d 503 (1957). For instance in the *Richmond v. Powers* case, *supra*, the sole question presented was whether the lower court erred in refusing to instruct the jury that the decedent was guilty of contributory negligence as a matter of law where the undisputed facts showed that he was killed when he stepped onto the tracks in front of a moving railroad train at night. In holding that the question of contributory negligence was a matter of fact, this Honorable Court stated:

> ". . . It is well settled that, where there is uncertainty as to the existence of either negligence, or contributory negligence, the question is not one of law, but of fact, and to be settled by a jury; and this, whether the uncertainty arises from a conflict in the testimony, or because, the facts being undisputed, fair minded men will honestly draw different conclusions from them."

Similarly, in *Best vs. District of Columbia*, *supra*, in reversing the trial court's action in directing a verdict, this honorable Court said:

> "*Where uncertainty arises either from a conflict of testimony or because facts being undisputed, fair minded men may honestly draw different conclusions from them, the question is not one of law, but of fact to be settled by the jury.*" (Italics supplied.)

Again in the case of *Lavender vs. Kurn, supra,* in overruling the Missouri Supreme Court, which had held that the evidence of negligence was not sufficiently substantial to warrant submission of the question to the jury, stated:

> "It is no answer to say that the jury's verdict involved speculation or conjecture. Whenever facts are in dispute or the evidence is such that fair minded men might draw different inferences, a measure of speculation or conjecture is required on the part of those whose duty it is to settle the dispute by choosing what seems to them to be the most reasonable inference. . . . it being immaterial that the court might draw a contrary inference or feel that another conclusion is more reasonable."

The Court of Appeals in the instant case took it upon itself to decide that it was reasonably necessary to sound a siren, thereby depriving the jury of the right to determine what was reasonably necessary under the circumstances. Such a holding is completely contrary to decisions of other Courts of Appeal. For instance, in the case of *Burchan vs. J. P. Stevens & Company,* 209 F.2d 35 (CCA 4th, 1954), the plaintiff's truck made a left turn into a roadside restaurant and was struck by the defendant's on-coming truck. A Virginia statute prohibited the crossing of a double line painted on the highway. The defendant argued that the plaintiff was negligent as a matter of law in driving across the double line in the center of the highway, and the trial court granted the defendant's motion for a judgment notwithstanding the verdict. On appeal the Court of Ap-

peals reversed the lower court and quoted with approval from *Waid v. Chesapeake & O. R. Co.*, 14 F. 2d 90, 93:

> "There is no fixed standard in the law by which a Court is enabled to arbitrarily say in every case what conduct shall be considered reasonable and prudent, and what shall constitute ordinary care, under any and all circumstances. The terms 'ordinary care', 'reasonable prudence,' and such like terms, as applied to the conduct and affairs of men, have a relative significance, and cannot be arbitrarily defined. *What may be deemed ordinary care in one case, may under different surroundings and circumstances, be gross negligence. The policy of the law has relegated the determination of such questions to the jury, under proper instructions from the Court.* It is their province to note the special circumstances and surroundings of each particular case, and then say whether the conduct of the parties in that case was such as would be expected of reasonable, prudent men, under a similar state of affairs. *When a given state of facts is such that reasonable men may fairly differ upon the question as to whether there was negligence or not, the determination of the matter is for the jury. It is only where the facts are such that all reasonable men must draw the same conclusion from them that the question of negligence is ever considered as one of law for the court.* . . ."

> "Whether a question is one for the decision of the court or of the jury is a question of federal practice as to which we are governed by federal and not by state decisions. We are bound by state decisions as to the substantive law applicable in a case of

> this sort, but by federal law, not state law, as to whether a question is for the decision of the judge or the jury under the Seventh Amendment.'" (Italics Supplied.)

Because under the Constitution of Louisiana appellate state courts are permitted to review the facts, whether found by jury or judge, there are no Louisiana cases involving a determination of what matters constitute questions of fact for determination by the trier of the facts, and what matters are questions of law for the Court. However, there are several decisions from other jurisdictions almost directly on point, holding that when an ordinance or statute requires that a vehicle sound a siren, slow down or stop, as may be reasonably necessary for safety, the determination of the question of whether the driver of the vehicle has complied with the ordinance is one to be determined by the trier of the facts and not by the court. The case of *Travis v. Collett*, 218 Minn. 592, 17 NW 2d 68 (1944), involved the interpretation of a traffic statute reading as follows:

> "The driver of any authorized emergency vehicle, when responding to an emergency call, *upon approaching a red or stop signal or any stop sign, shall slow down as necessary for safety*, but may proceed cautiously past such red or stop signs or signal after sounding siren and displaying red lights." (Italics supplied.)

In this case the emergency vehicle ran a stop sign at 35 miles per hour without slowing down. The Trial Court instructed the jury that this action in the light of the statute was negligence as a matter of law, and

submitted the case to the jury only on the issues of proximate cause and contributory negligence. The Appellate Court reversed and said:

> "Whether the *slowing down is necessary, the extent of slowing down that is required*, and whether the driver proceeded with caution or due care depend upon all the facts and circumstances of each case and *are questions the determination of which rests peculiarly with the trier of fact*: Rogers v. Minneapolis St. Ry. Co., Minn. '6 N.W. 2d 758, filed December 8, 1944. If reasonable minds may differ as to how the questions should be answered, the court should not decide them as a matter of law." (Italics supplied.)

In the case of *Isaacs v. City and County of San Francisco*, 73 CA2d 621, 167 P.2d 221, the occupants of an automobile sued for injuries sustained when the car in which they were riding was struck at an intersection by a fire apparatus owned by the defendant City. The material parts of the applicable statute provided that negligence on the part of emergency vehicles could not be predicated on breaches of the traffic laws when the "vehicle is . . . responding to but not upon returning from the fire alarm" and "when the driver of said vehicle sounds the siren as may be reasonably necessary", but this exemption "shall not relieve the driver of any said vehicle from the duty to drive with due regard for the safety of all persons using the highway nor shall the provisions of this section *protect* any such driver from the consequences *of an arbitrary exercise* of the provisions declared in this section" (Italics sup-

plied). One of the material questions for determination was whether a siren was sounded and *the necessity of giving a siren signal*. The appellate court reversed a non-suit against plaintiff and stated:

> "In the present case whether a siren signal was given, and the necessity of giving a signal are questions of fact which on motion for non-suit must be determined in plaintiff's favor."

Counsel readily admits that undisputed evidence of the violation of a traffic statute is negligence as a matter of law when the language of the statute conclusively determines a standard of care applicable. However, when the standard of care required by the statute is couched in the terms of reasonableness or reasonable necessity, then the question of whether the standard created has been met is a question of fact for the jury. In the case of *Thomas v. Roland*, 162 F.Supp. 622 (U.S.D.C. E.D. Pa. 1958) the plaintiff sued for damages sustained in an intersectional collision on a highway in the State of Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania Vehicle Code provided that the right of way granted by the statute did not relieve the driver of a vehicle on a through highway from the duty to drive with due regard to the safety of vehicles entering the highway, nor the arbitrary exercise of the right of way. The Trial Court charged the jury that if it found that the driver on the right of way street did not look for approaching traffic, he was "guilty of negligence as a matter of law". In granting the defense's motion for a new trial from an adverse jury verdict, the Court said:

> "It has been decided in Pennsylvania that the violation of a statute regulating highway traffic is

negligence as a matter of law when the statute is final and conclusive in determining the standard of care to be applied to motorists: Jinks v. Currie, 1936, 324 Pa. 532, 188 A. 356 (failing to give a left turn signal); d'Ambrosio v. Philadelphia, 1946, 354 Pa. 403, 47 A. 2d 256, 174 A.L.R. 1166 (riding on a tailgate of a truck); Landis v. Conestoga Transportation Co., 1944, 349 Pa. 97, 100, 36 A. 2d 465 (exceeding statutory speed limit). However, when a statute creates a standard so vague as to require definition by a court or jury (Restatement, Torts, Sec. 285, Comment b) then it is for a jury to determine whether or not a defendant under the facts was guilty of negligence, and where such a statute is under consideration, a court can declare all acts of violation of the statute to be negligence as a matter of law where the question before it is whether or not a defendant is guilty of negligence.

The Traffic Ordinance of the City of New Orleans in the instant case requiring an emergency vehicle to sound a siren "to the extent reasonably necessary" certainly sets up a definite standard about which the minds of fair men might differ in determining whether the standard has been met. The Trial Court clearly instructed the jury on the standard of care imposed upon an emergency vehicle on an emergency mission under the Traffic Ordinances of the City of New Orleans, advising them that a violation of this Ordinance constituted negligence. The jury returned a verdict for the defendant. By reversing the judgment based on this verdict, the Court of Appeals has usurped the function of a Federal jury.

VII.

CONCLUSION.

For the foregoing reasons it is respectfully suggested that a writ of certiorari should be granted and that the decision of the Court of Appeals should be reversed and the judgment of the trial court reinstated.

Respectfully submitted.

ERNEST A. CARRERE, JR., of
JONES, WALKER, WAECHTER,
POITEVENT, CARRERE &
DENEGRE,
Attorneys for Petitioner,
1547 National Bank of
Commerce Building,
New Orleans 12, Louisiana

Of Counsel:
A. J. WAECHTER, JR.

CERTIFICATE

This certifies that copy of this Petition has been served on Counsel for ANTHONY LoCICERO, ET AL., Respondents, by delivery in person on the ____ day of OCTOBER, 1959.

ERNEST A. CARRERE, JR.

APPENDIX A.

Decision of the United States Court of Appeals.
(June 30, 1959.)

Before HUTCHESON, Chief Judge, and CAMERON and BROWN, Circuit Judges.

CAMERON, Circuit Judge: Anthony Lo Cicero, an elderly gentleman, was struck and fatally injured by a police car answering an emergency call about five o'clock P.M. on Decatur Street in New Orleans, Louisiana. Appellants (plaintiffs below), his children and sole survivors, sued appellee (defendant below), Columbia Casualty Company, the insurance carrier of the City of New Orleans, alleging that their father was negligently killed. The case was submitted to a jury, which returned a verdict against appellants and in favor of the insurance company.

Appellants seek a reversal on the ground that the verdict was contrary to the law and the evidence; that the court committed specified errors in refusing instructions requested by them, and in charging the jury too favorably to appellee; and on other grounds which it is not necessary to discuss in this opinion. Our decision will be based upon the error of the court in submitting to the jury the question of defendant's negligence vel non instead of, as it should have done, instructing the jury that, under the city ordinance, conditionally exempting emergency vehicles from normal safety observance, and the undisputed evidence of the driver of the police car

that he was deliberately and intentionally operating the car without sounding the required siren signal, defendant was, as matter of law, guilty of negligence, and the only issues for the jury's consideration were proximate cause, contributory negligence, and last clear chance.

The facts set forth by appellee as constituting those which it contends the jury was warranted in accepting, are these: "On October 11, 1956, at approximately 5:00 P.M. the police department was notified that there was a holdup in progress at the French Market on Decatur Street. A City of New Orleans police car, driven by Patrolman Conrad, accompanied by Patrolman Cassaro, was immediately dispatched to the scene from the First District police station on Basin Street. With its red flashing dome light turned on, [but because of the hold-up alarm siren not sounding] the car proceeded from Basin Street onto Toulouse Street and turned left onto Decatur Street in the direction of the French Market. When the driver of the squad car reached Decatur Street, he noticed that there was a long line of traffic stopped on Decatur Street for a red signal light at the intersection of Decatur Street with Wilkinson Street. The police car drove to the left of the line of traffic, proceeded to the red traffic light at the intersection of Wilkinson Street and stopped momentarily (or almost stopped), proceeded across the red light, turning back into its right lane of traffic, and then proceeded down Decatur Street toward the French Market on its emergency mission. After having passed the line of stopped traffic and the red signal light at Wilkinson

Street, the police vehicle had a clear roadway on Decatur Street to the French Market several blocks away. There was a long line of traffic to the left of the police car on Decatur Street heading in the opposite direction which was stopped for the Wilkinson Street red light. This stopped line of traffic extended past the intersection of Decatur Street and St. Peter Street or a distance of about a block and a half. As the police car entered the intersection of St. Peter Street, the driver saw the plaintiffs' deceased father Mr. Lo Cicero, suddenly emerge from behind the stopped automobiles without looking for approaching traffic, apparently attempting to cross Decatur Street from Jackson Square to the river or from the driver's left to right. Patrolman Conrad slammed on his brakes as soon as Mr. Lo Cicero appeared from behind the parked cars and attempted to avoid striking him. Unfortunately, however, just before the police car came to a stop, it hit Mr. Lo Cicero with its right front headlight. Although the police car was being driven at a speed of between 30 to 35 miles per hour at the time that Mr. Lo Cicero appeared from behind the stopped vehicles, it did not move more than a . . . [few feet after] striking him. The witnesses closest to the scene of the accident placed the location of the accident at about 40 to 50 feet beyond the intersection of Decatur and St. Peter Streets."

Appellants' evidence developed quite a different case. According to their proof, Decatur Street, 51.5 feet wide, ran substantially north and south and was used by traffic as a two-way street. It was intersected at right angles by St. Peter Street and by Wilkinson Street 165.3

feet to the south. The decedent approached Decatur walking east along St. Peter and found a line of vehicular traffic on the west side of the street, all vehicles being stationary in obedience to the red traffic light at Wilkinson Street. He passed between two of these vehicles and looked in both directions observing no traffic in movement and, without the benefit of siren signal, which was deliberately not being sounded, he began at a normal pace to cross Decatur angling somewhat north of the east and west course of St. Peter. The red traffic light at Wilkinson was in clear view and its protective assurance extended to decedent on St. Peter. After crossing approximately 43 feet of the intersection, he had reached a point substantially 8.5 feet from the east curb of Decatur when he was struck by a New Orleans police car, which had skidded 58 feet before striking him.

The police car had proceeded in the west or left lane of Decatur until it reached Wilkinson and was obscured from decedent's view by the unbroken line of immobilized motor vehicles extending from Wilkinson to and beyond where decedent entered it at St. Peter. The automobile made an "S" turn as it crossed Wilkinson in order to pass from the left to the right side of the street and take advantage of the unoccupied traffic lanes resulting from the red light. The point where he was struck was about 17 feet east of the center line of Decatur. Assuming that the automobile was being driven at a speed of 30 miles per hour, it was traveling 44 feet per second; and assuming that decedent was walking 4 miles per hour, he would have moved 5.03 feet per

second. In other words, the police car was traveling approximately eight times as fast as decedent.

Both parties in effect concede that in view of the refusal of the driver to sound the siren, the crucial point in the case is the application and effect of the City Code Section of New Orleans regulating emergency vehicles,[1] the pertinent portion reading:

> "The provisions of this chapter regulating the operation, parking and standing of vehicles shall apply to authorized emergency vehicles, as defined in this article, except as follows:
>
> A driver when operating any such vehicle in an emergency . . . may . . . (2) proceed past a red or stop signal or stop sign, but only after slowing down to the extent necessary for safe operation; and
>
> (3) Exceed the prima facie speed limit so long as he does not endanger life or property.
>
> The foregoing exemption granted in reference to the movement of an authorized emergency vehicle shall *apply only when the driver of such vehicle sounds a siren, bell or exhaust whistle to the extent reasonably necessary* and the vehicle displays a lighted red lamp visible from the front as a warning to others. This shall not, however, protect the driver of any such vehicle from the consequences of a reckless disregard of the safety of others." [Emphasis added.]

The italicized words apply to the driver of the vehicle involved and permit him to exceed the speed limit, run

[1] Motor Vehicle and Traffic Ordinances of the City of New Orleans, Chapter 38 of the Code of 1956, §38-37.

on the left side of the street, violate red lights, etc., only when he sounds a siren to the extent reasonably necessary. That means that the duty varies from second to second dependent upon the conditions with which the driver is faced. This police car was being operated at substantially the time when the "five o'clock traffic" was cluttering almost all streets and in addition when employees of a nearby manufacturing plant were leaving in the haste which generally attends those eager to get home or to a refreshing drink following a day's work.

The duties laid upon the driver of an emergency vehicle by this ordinance are exacting and require fast thinking, close and constant attention, speedy reactions and calm, quick judgment, uninfluenced by any factor except consideration of the public safety. Under its explicit terms, the right to ignore the safeguards which pedestrians habitually and instinctively rely upon in making their hazardous way through the mazes of motor vehicles which confront them at every hand, is a conditional privilege, hedged in by such phrases as "to the extent necessary for safe operation" and "so long as he does not endanger life or property." A reasonable construction of the ordinance would not permit these safeguards so clearly imposed upon the driver to be dispensed with by him either of his own motion or on orders from his superiors.

In the court below appellee, realizing the strong impact as a matter of law of the testimony of the driver, that, because of the nature of the police call then being answered, he had deliberately done away with the safeguards which alone justified emergency driving and as a

result had illegally subjected all persons and traffic on the street to great peril, sought to introduce evidence tending to show that these safeguards placed upon the driver had, because of the nature of the call, been abrogated by orders from his superiors and the driver was not therefore at fault. The proffer was made while Officer Cassaro, one of the occupants of the police car, was being questioned by appellee's attorney. After testifying positively that the siren was not being operated, he explained its deliberate non-operation in this way, that he was answering a holdup call, which is a rare call, and if they had used the siren, "it can be heard all over the French Market area, because it is a small area, and whoever was committing the holdup would hear it and normally would naturally leave right away." This statement demonstrating that the officer was giving primary consideration, not to the safety of the public on the streets but the desirability of catching those who were committing the crime, appellee's counsel endeavored to exculpate him from his admitted fault by showing that the portion of the ordinance requiring the driver to drive so as not to endanger life or property had in effect been nullified so that the driver was excused by the action of his superiors in instructing drivers to omit using the siren when answering holdup calls.[2]

---

[2] "Q. Did you have instructions from your superiors — rather, please state whether or not you had instructions from your superiors when going to a holdup in progress that you should not use the siren?"

Mr. Reinold: "I object to any instructions from his superiors because that cannot contradict the Code of New Orleans relative to emergency operation. . . . that cannot contravene the Code of the City of New Orleans relative to the operation of motor vehicle of emergency vehicles."

The Court: "I'll sustain the objection. The point is this, Mr. Waechter, that if the instructions are negligent, then the liability is the same. . . ."

Appellants objected to his proffer on the ground that the drivers' superiors cannot contravene the Code of New Orleans relative to the emergency operation of motor vehicles, and the court, stating in effect that neither the driver nor his superiors had authority to suspend or vary the ordinance correctly sustained the objection.

This, we think, was a manifestly correct ruling, and the court's attention having been directly called to the admitted fault of the driver in willfully violating the ordinance, it was plain error not to charge the jury directly that the driver was negligent. As stated, the ordinance laid the duty upon the driver to do what was reasonably required in the interest of safety at every moment and under all conditions. The ordinance made no exception in the case of holdups. If, as counsel was seeking to prove the driver's superiors had taken away from him the right and duty to use judgment fitting the particular emergency and to act for the protection of human life by the use of the siren, they had in effect repealed the ordinance, or at least, in effect, rendered it sterile. The genius of the ordinance was to place human life above such activities as intercepting those who had forcibly set upon others to take their money or property. The proof tendered in attempted justification of the admittedly open violation of the ordinance would if it had been accepted as an excuse, operate to shut off the use of all sirens when cars were engaged in such a mission. This would be in contravention of the ordinance and would in fact amount to a defiance of its terms. It would be difficult to overestimate the impor-

tance of such proof. Anyone who has grown accustomed to the repeated and persistent wail of sirens of emergency vehicles going through the streets of New Orleans and other cities would know instinctively that the average pedestrian relies upon being warned of approaching danger by a siren—a much more challenging and efficacious means of warning than flashing lights.

It is true that the plaintiff did not except to the charge for failure to instruct that the defendant was guilty of negligence as matter of law in failing to sound the siren or give other audible signal; nor request a charge of his own to that effect. Under the circumstances, however, revealed by the evidence in this case, including the undisputed proof of the driver that he was violating the ordinance, it was plain error not so to instruct the jury. Appellants in their brief make this quite clear. Arguing that failure of the police car to sound a siren, horn or other audible signal was a major cause of the accident, the appellants point out that the mere sounding of the siren or blowing of the horn could have easily been heard 315 feet away at the intersection of St. Peter Street and certainly, if the horn had been sounded or the siren blown, as the police vehicle reached Wilkinson Street, some 165 feet from St. Peter Street, the pedestrian could undoubtedly have heard the horn and taken measures to protect himself.

For the failure of the district court to instruct the jury that defendant was guilty of negligence as matter of law and to submit to it, therefore, only the issues of

proximate cause, contributory negligence, and last clear chance the judgment is REVERSED and the cause is REMANDED for a new trial consistent with the views above expressed.

REVERSED and REMANDED.

APPENDIX B.

The Code of the City of New Orleans 1956.
Section 38-37—Exemptions to authorized emergency vehicles.

"The provisions of this chapter regulating the operation, parking and standing of vehicles shall apply to authorized emergency vehicles, as defined in this article, except as follows:

A driver when operating any such vehicle in an emergency, except when otherwise directed by a Police Officer, may:

(1) Park or stand notwithstanding the provisions of this article;

(2) Proceed past a red or stop signal or stop sign, but only after slowing down to the extent necessary for safe operation; and

(3) Exceed the prima facie speed limit so long as he does not endanger life or property.

The foregoing exemptions granted in reference to the movement of an authorized emergency vehicle shall apply only when the driver of such vehicle sounds a siren, bell or exhaust whistle to the extent reasonably necessary and the vehicle displays a lighted red lamp visible from the front as a warning to others. They shall not, however, protect the driver of any such vehicle from the consequences of a reckless disregard of the safety of others. . . ."